


IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Richmond Division



HAROLD BARTRUM,

Petitioner,

v.

Civil Action No. **3:18CV462**

RAY ORMOND,

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Harold Bartrum, a federal inmate proceeding *pro se*, filed this petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging the execution of his sentence. On May 28, 2019, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation wherein he recommended granting the motion to supplement and denying the § 2241 Petition. (ECF No. 17.) The Court advised Bartrum that he could file objections within fourteen (14) days after the entry of the Report and Recommendation. Bartrum has not responded and the time to do so has expired.

“The magistrate makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court.” *Estrada v. Witkowski*, 816 F. Supp. 408, 410 (D.S.C. 1993) (citing *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976)). This Court “shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). “The filing of objections to a magistrate’s report enables the district judge to focus attention on those issues—factual and legal—that are at the heart of the parties’ dispute.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 147 (1985) (footnote omitted). In the absence of a specific written objection, this Court may adopt a magistrate judge’s recommendation without conducting a de

novo review. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 316 (4th Cir. 2005).

There being no objections, and the Court having determined that the Report and Recommendation is correct on its merits, the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 17) will be ACCEPTED and ADOPTED. The Motion to Supplement (ECF No. 7) will be GRANTED. The Motion for Summary Judgment will be GRANTED. (ECF No. 10.) The Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim will be DENIED AS MOOT. (ECF No. 9.) Bartrum's § 2241 Petition (ECF No. 1) will be DENIED. Bartrum's claims and the action will be DISMISSED. A certificate of appealability will be DENIED.

An appropriate Order will accompany this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: **JUN 19 2019**
Richmond, Virginia



M. Hannah Cauley
United States District Judge